DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 233 EA 030 549

AUTHOR Markowitz, Nancy Lourie; Whittaker, Andrea
TITLE Beyond the Professional Development School Model: The Professional Development District.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999). Presenters were Edwin Diaz, Brenda Fikes, Suzie Henriod, Michael Kass, Marty Krovetz, Dina Lee, Jody Latter, and Dale Mitchell. Discussants were Linda Lambert and Ann Lieberman.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Programs; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Partnerships in Education; *Professional Development; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; School Organization

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the conditions of university/districtwide partnering that can aid systemic public education change. It introduces a university/school partnership known as the Triple "L" (Lifelong Learning and Leadership) Collaborative. The text details shared responsibility, shared accountability, alignment of teacher-performance standards, multiple linkages across people and programs, and relationship building. It discusses how these conditions are embedded in a professional-development district model and analyzes the effects of a development district partnership on student learning, adult learning, and institutional change. It presents the necessary conditions for school reform and outlines the goals of the Triple "L" Collaborative, which are: develop a seamless continuum of inquiry-based professional development at all levels of teacher development, promote teachers' capacity to provide leadership at their school, support research and evaluate efforts continuously, and implement and sustain redesign at both the university and the district and school-site levels. Some of the elements that are analyzed in detail are preservice preparation, a school/university full-intern program, new teacher support, an Master of Arts in education with an emphasis in teacher leadership, and linkages among adults, programs, and institutions. Three tables depict data sources and preliminary findings and summarize key data-collection processes. (Contains 19 references.) (RJM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 444 233

Beyond the Professional Development School Model: The Professional Development District

an interactive symposium presentation for the Annual American Educational Research Association Conference Montréal, Canada April, 1999

Co-Chairs

Nancy Lourié Markowitz
San José State University

Andrea Whittaker
San José State University

Presentors

Edwin Diaz, Oak Grove District
Brenda Fikes, San Jose State University
Suzie Henriod, Oak Grove District
Michael Kass, Bay Area School Reform Collaborative
Marty Krovetz, San Jose State University
Dina Lee, Oak Grove District
Jody Latter, Campbell Union School District
Dale Mitchell, Oak Grove District

Discussants

Linda Lambert, California State University,Hayward
Ann Lieberman, Carnegie Institute for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Whittaker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EA 030549

Beyond the Professional Development School Model:
The Professional Development District
a paper presented at the
April, 1999 American Educational Research Association Conference

Nancy Lourié Markowitz, Ph.D.
San José State University

Andrea Whittaker, Ph.D.
San José State University

Over the next ten years in California, the number of teachers needed by the schools will increase by 30% (California Commission on the Education of Teachers, 1996). That means that an unusually large number of new teachers are entering the field. While overwhelming in one respect, this phenomenon provides an opportunity for school reform not seen in the last two decades. Recognizing the need and the opportunity to restructure schooling and change the culture of the educational system in both the schools and in university teacher education, several reports nave called for higher education to assume a more active role in the K-12 education reform movement as well as reform teacher education (Holmes Group, 1986; Carnegie Forum, 1986). *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (Hart and Burr, 1996), calls for university-level educators to focus more on fieldwork in schools. The report also recommends more joint planning of teacher education curriculum and field experiences, more site-based preparation, and more supervisory training for cooperating teachers. Recent private, state, and federal funding initiatives have also sent a clear message that university/school collaboration must happen in order to nurture and sustain school reform.

Juxtaposed to these recommendations for school and teacher education reform are the well-documented issues which one faces when trying to initiate and sustain school/university collaboration. Researchers have documented the need to examine and re-design roles and responsibilities, values, decision-making processes, and resource allocation (Hord, 1986; Lieberman, 1986, 1994; Tye, 1992; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Schlechty, 1993 among others).

The Professional Development School (PDS) model has become one of the most widely used forms of university/school collaboration, designed to promote both teacher professional development and school reform. The PDS model has provided an extremely helpful framework for thinking about, and engaging in university/school collaboration. However, using this model, we must accept that the change process will proceed school by school, from the inside/out. We suggest that this form of collaboration, while potentially powerful at the site level, is helpful, but not sufficient if university/school partnerships are to foster systemic educational reform.

We suggest that university/school collaboration must engage entire districts, as well as the university, in multiple ways at multiple levels if any significant change is to occur in our schools. Consider the power of professional development programs that begin with preservice preparation and continue through new teacher support and advanced teacher leadership development with a focus on the kinds of skills, knowledge, and dispositions needed by all the partners (schools, districts, and university) to engage in reform efforts. In this paper, we offer conditions of university/district-wide partnering that we believe are essential to systemic public education change efforts. These conditions arise from our work in one district-focused university/school partnership known as the Triple "L" Collaborative. They include:

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

- shared responsibility
- shared accountability
- alignment of teacher performance standards, assessment practices, and vision of teaching, learning, and professional development
- multiple linkages across people and programs
- relationship building

We will first describe each of the conditions and then discuss how these conditions are embedded in what we term a *professional development district* model. Finally, we will discuss what we have learned thus far from one professional development district partnership's impact on student learning, adult learning, and institutional change.

Necessary conditions for school reform

University/school collaboration focused around a professional development school can promote what Goodlad (1987) refers to as a rich, symbiotic relationship between the school and individuals from the university working with that school. The partnership benefits the university in multiple ways. Most school/university partnership efforts "focus on the induction of student teachers, interns, and beginning teachers" (Myers, 1996). It can promote a strong preservice teacher education program and restructuring efforts at a given PDS site, providing high quality teaching models for preservice candidates, something that is typically in short supply within teacher credential programs. It may also foster renewal of at least a strand of the university teacher education program as teachers collaborate with university faculty to conceptualize preservice course content and experiences.

In addition, the PDS faculty associates (cooperating teachers) may participate in programs which encourage the development of teacher leadership skills among the school faculty. For example, PDS teachers working with preservice candidates may participate in seminars which focus on the development of their own coaching practice. Or they may begin collaborating with university faculty on action research projects. Given the breadth and concentration of professional development activity occurring at the PDS, changes in teachers' instructional practices may occur with attendant growth in student achievement. Further, the work going on between the university and the school may promote university teacher education renewal, at least within the program at the PDS site.

However, we also know that PDS sites often report a feeling of being marginalized by both the university and the school district (Stoddard, 1999). We suggest that this occurs because district and university level leadership is not deeply involved in the planning and implementation of the programs initiated, and therefore are not well positioned to make connections between the advances which may be occurring at the PDS and the rest of the work happening within the district. Specifically, we suggest that the district and the university, as institutions, must be involved in particular ways in order for systemic reform to take root.

Shared responsibility. The first condition of university/district partnering is institutional acceptance of shared responsibility for the work. The absence of this element in a partnership is apparent when people from either the school or the university look to, and expect something to happen at the other institution without accepting some responsibility for the process. In a PDS, shared responsibility may be evident when the teachers, administrators, and university faculty plan the preservice program together, strategize together about how to provide needed professional development for the classroom teachers, and so on.

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

However, most often, shared responsibility is experienced within the PDS, only. What is needed is a sense of shared responsibility for the professional development work of the PDS by the entire district. In order for this to occur, the vision for professional development present in the PDS must be seen as consistent with the goals of district-wide professional development. In practice, substantial university/district conversations must occur around the work of the partnership, and district superintendents and assistant superintendents must be directly involved in program planning (Murphy, 1993).

Shared accountability. Shared accountability means that everyone involved in the partnership shares responsibility for the outcomes. For example, if the teachers at the school site are not happy with the quality of preservice candidates they, ideally, feel responsible to work with the university to ameliorate the situation, rather than pointing fingers at the university (or vice versa). At a PDS, all of the participants develop a sense of shared accountability for the professional development programs present. They may be involved in the development of new programs and in the assessment of existing ones. If shared accountability is present only at the school site level, however, systemic change is unlikely.

Alignment. The third condition is that of alignment across institutions. This condition requires 1) a shared vision of teaching and learning, and professional development; 2) shared selection processes for teacher candidates and the teachers in whose classrooms they work; and 3) common standards and assessment practices. The shared vision of teaching, learning, and professional development fosters consonance between the professional development programs offered by the university and those available within the school. In order for the district to give funding and other kinds of support to the partnership the district leadership must have a broad vision of the partnership as furthering its own goals. Both the university and the district must view partnering as mutually advantageous, allowing each institution to reach its goals more effectively as a result of doing it together than they could by going it alone.

Shared selection processes refers to how people are selected to participate within programs. Universities are usually frustrated because they have little or no say in the classrooms chosen for their preservice candidates. Districts often use the shopping list approach, asking site administrators for two second grade teachers, one kindergarten teacher, and so forth. The issue of whether a classroom teacher models best practices as emphasized within the university program is rarely considered. By the same token, schools are asked to accept teacher candidates to work in their classrooms without any say in who these candidates are. A lack of empowerment is felt by those in both institutions. In a district-wide partnership, preservice teachers are able to participate in classrooms where they see first class modeling of best practices they have learned about in their university seminars; and district personnel have a say in the teacher candidates who will work in their classrooms.

The PDS may develop a shared selection process related to both teacher candidates and the master teachers with whom they work. This is certainly powerful and empowering for those individuals participating. However, the question of how this shared selection process is extended to the entire district or to the entire teacher education program, is not clear. Neither is how preservice teachers might find jobs in the district later or if so, how these positions will be aligned with their training. For example, at the university, do school and university faculty routinely meet as a panel to select new candidates? At the district level, do university and district people routinely decide together which teachers within the entire district will work with preservice candidates? Unless this process is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE
Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

embedded in the way the entire district and the university interact with each other, no systemic change can occur.

Third, common standards and assessment practices refers to alignment of teacher performance standards and teacher assessment between the university and the schools. Currently, it is not common practice for the university to ensure that the standards and methods it uses to assess the performance of preservice candidates is consistent with the standards and methods used within the districts in its service area.

The PDS addresses the need for a shared vision of teaching, learning and professional development. Indeed, schools typically must vote to become a PDS after extensive discussions with university faculty and the development of a common vision. However, the acceptance of this shared vision across the entire district is usually not addressed, except in the most general terms of a district/university agreement.

Linkages. The fourth element involves the recognition of the importance, and implementation of many kinds of explicit linkages across people and programs. These links must extend from "inside" the school, "outside" to the rest of the district and the university, and "outside-in", from the district and university to inside individual schools. The PDS model links teachers and administrators at a given school site with the university. Further, it may link initial teacher preparation with beginning teacher support, and possibly teacher leadership development. However, these links are internal to a given school. The power to propel systemic change lies, in part, in the capacity of the PDS to promote linkages across educators involved at all stages of professional development throughout the district and at the university.

Are the programs across the university/school partnerships linked to one another in some explicit ways. For example, do beginning teachers have opportunities to interact with preservice candidates. Do experienced teachers working with preservice candidates have the opportunity to interact with, and learn from one another on a routine basis? Further, does the district see the university preservice program as providing a pipeline of well trained teachers for their district? Murphy (1993) notes that in order for school reform efforts to be effective, support must be present at the highest levels of district leadership as well as at the individual school site. If the district does see this link between the university and its schools, how does the district level leadership ensure that site administrators understand the kind of training the teacher candidates have experienced, and are able to support them, even if (especially if), they run contrary to the current school culture. Do district level leaders find ways to encourage dialog between the PDS principals and all other site administrators (inside/out) to encourage cross-pollination of ideas within the district site.

Relationships. The fifth element revolves around the importance of personal relationships developed over time. Probably the most important condition, the one that will make or break any reform effort, is whether the individuals involved value, trust, and respect each other, no matter what their role is. People at all levels need to be able to leave their job titles at the door. While this condition may be present at a PDS site, it does not typically extend from inside the school, out.

Relationships develop not solely around the crafting of a vision statement, but because of a common passion and commitment to a particular project such as a new program. When everyone, from district superintendents to teachers, to university faculty see the partnership as a "third space" (Betty, 1999) where they can explore issues safely, learn from one another, and laugh together, the partnership has a much better chance of flourishing and

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

affecting the larger educational community. Every individual involved starts making connections regarding how they can further the work of the partnership through their job role and responsibilities.

Many kinds of opportunities must be systematically built into any collaboration to insure that people get to know each other on a professional and personal level and that these relationships exist across all levels of the district and university. What remains undeveloped are the relationships between those at the school site and the rest of the district community and sometimes those at the school site and the larger university teacher education community.

In summary, we suggest that university/school collaboration requires all that the PDS model promotes, but must go several steps further in order to promote and sustain systemic educational reform. The Triple "L" Collaborative is an example of a university /school partnership that is taking those next steps, working from inside the school/out and from outside at the university or district inside the school simultaneously, with the goal of district-wide systemic reform.

A Professional Development District Model: The Triple "L" Collaborative

The Triple "L" (Lifelong Learning and Leadership) Collaborative is a university/ school partnership including Campbell Union Elementary and Oak Grove School Districts, and San José State University. Oak Grove District is situated in south San Jose, with a rapidly changing student population. It has sixteen elementary schools and three middle schools which serve an ethnically and linguistically diverse student population. The district has experienced relatively little teacher turnover until the last year. With an increasing number of teachers reaching retirement age and the new state mandate for reduced class size, the district is anticipating hiring over 30 new teachers each of the next few years.

Campbell School District is situated in west San Jose, with a culturally and linguistically diverse student population. It has eight elementary schools and three middle schools. Over the past several years the district has experienced significant teacher turnover due to retirements. That, along with the initiative to lower class size, has resulted in approximately one-third of the district teaching staff having two years or less of teaching experience. Both districts have been engaged in significant professional development efforts particularly in the areas of literacy and technology.

The goals of the Triple "L" Collaborative are:

- to develop a seamless continuum of inquiry-based professional development at the preservice, beginning teacher and experienced teacher levels, collaboratively planned and supported by all three institutions, which results in stronger teaching and therefore, increased student achievement;
- to promote teachers' capacity to provide leadership at their school and at the district levels by developing leadership skills among teachers at all stages of professional development;
- to research and evaluate our efforts continuously and have the data inform the on-going decision-making process; and
- to implement and sustain redesign at both the university and the district and school site levels which promotes and sustains high caliber professional development opportunities and therefore, high student achievement.

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

The Triple "L" currently has three professional development programs which are the backbone of the partnership: the TE Collaborative Partial Internship Program, the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program, and the MA in Teacher Leadership program. Each one will be briefly described and then the entire Collaborative will be examined in light of the five conditions of collaboration set forth above.

Preservice Preparation

The TE Collaborative Internship Program. The TE Collaborative CLAD/Multiple Subject Internship Program was designed jointly by a group of district and university people. Specifically, the TE Collaborative Internship Program is intended to:

- provide teacher candidates with a strong professional development program that relies on gradual induction into practice and strong modeling by highly qualified practitioners;
- provide close links between university coursework and fieldwork;
- provide participating districts with a pipeline of highly qualified new teachers that they have helped to grow;
- provide teacher leaders within each district with release time to support other beginning teachers;
- increase the leadership skills of district teachers by providing support in coaching and supervisory practices; and
- align the preservice program preparation, teacher performance standards and assessment practices with the districts' beginning teacher support program and districts' vision.

Teacher candidates in this option receive 20% pay as an intern the first year working in a Faculty Associate's (cooperating teacher) classroom, providing one day release time each week for their Faculty Associate to work in a leadership role within the larger school community (in most cases acting as a beginning teacher support provider to one or more teachers). In year two, the TE Collaborative candidates work in their own classroom within one of the two participating districts as a full time, fully paid, intern, while continuing university seminars. Assuming they do well, the second year of the preservice program counts toward tenure in the district. Candidates receive their teaching credential at the end of the second year. The first cohort of candidates graduating this May, 1999, numbers seventeen (14). Twenty more candidates will receive their credentials in May, 2000 and we anticipate admitting 26 new candidates in Fall, 1999.

The Teacher Education Collaborative Internship program has altered the role of the teacher in whose classroom a preservice candidate completes "student teaching". Hence, we changed their title from "cooperating teacher" to "Faculty Associate". The selection process for becoming a Faculty Associate is rigorous. Interested teachers must complete a questionnaire, self-assess themselves using the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), and participate in an interview which includes both district and university people. In addition, the candidate's site administrator is asked to supply a letter of support and to complete a rating of the teacher using the same CSTP standards.

Faculty Associates share evaluative power with the university supervisor and provide continuous input into the program content and structure. Further, they are released from the classroom for 2 1/2 hours on alternate Thursdays to discuss their practice with other Faculty Associates in their district and they are released one full day to mentor another

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

beginning teacher or engage in another leadership activity. Finally, they receive an enhanced stipend thanks to state and foundation grants.

School/University Full Intern Program. While this program is not housed fully within the Collaborative, it reflects the impact of the Triple "L" beyond the boundaries of our two school districts. The Coordinator, Brenda Fikes, served on the TE Collaborative Planning Committee. She took some of our basic elements, including the emphasis on teacher inquiry, the use of teacher performance standards, the teacher assessment process, periodic group meetings with school site administrators, and on-going support seminars for Faculty associates, and applied them to her program. Since the Full Intern Program extends to thirteen districts, we are influencing teacher preparation at SJSU beyond our program.

New Teacher Support. The two year structure of the TE Collaborative Internship Program option has enabled us to build a pre-service-to-beginning teacher support sequence. The teacher candidate spends the first year receiving intensive support from both the university and school faculty as they spend five days a week at school sites or in university seminars. The second year of the program, when the candidates assume responsibility for their own classroom of students as interns, they continue to receive substantial support from both district mentors and university professors. Members of the district and university teacher education faculty have had extensive discussions to insure that we are blending the university and district support for our candidates rather than "killing them with support".

The Triple "L" group received state funding to support a Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program (BTSA). Each of the districts had already begun to help new teachers. As a result of the grant, they were able to support more new teachers and begin combining efforts. We have aligned the BTSA program with the pre-service TE Collaborative in several ways. The Beginning Teacher Support Providers (BTSP) from both districts meet together bi-weekly to extend their skills as coaches, obtain support to guide their work with beginning teachers, and to develop a common vision and program across both districts. This support system is congruent with the bi-weekly meetings in which the Faculty associates participate in the TE Collaborative program. The focus of the beginning teacher support seminars continues the preservice focus on teacher inquiry.

MA in Education with an Emphasis in Teacher Leadership. The first cohort of forty-three candidates is graduating in May, 1999. A new cohort began the program in January, 1999. This program is an example of working from the outside/in and from the inside/out at the same time. The program is designed to develop leadership among teachers who can then support reform efforts at their school site and at the district level. The coordinator of the MA program meets monthly with all of the site administrators across both districts to keep them up to date on the work of the MA candidates and engage in discussion around the issues which arise when teachers take on leadership roles. Through this combination of working with teachers and administrators, we expect to increase each district's capacity to support and sustain reform efforts at individual school sites and across the districts.

Teachers are invited to apply from any school site within each district as part of a team of at least three individuals. The first cohort consisted of 9 school sites and 43 teachers. These teams have focused on school-based action research projects, developed in coordination with the site administrators; and have immersed themselves in the issues of what it takes to be a successful leader and the challenges of initiating change.

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

The MA program not only meets the needs of individuals interested in advanced study and increased salary; it also meets the needs of districts in need of an expanded cadre of teacher leaders to support change efforts. Similarly, the TE Collaborative Internship Program meets the needs not only of those wanting to obtain a teaching credential, but also of the district interested in helping to grow its own teachers to support district- wide reform. This reflects the key to the work of the Triple "L" - any professional development program undertaken must further district-wide as well as university restructuring efforts - a symbiotic relationship in practice.

In the next section we discuss how the conditions of district/university collaboration are embedded in the work of the Triple "L".

Shared responsibility. Within the Triple "L", programs are developed jointly by district and university representatives. The Steering Committee includes district assistant superintendents, school principals, faculty associates, curriculum directors, as well as university faculty; and the group decides together what the priorities of the partnership are and what funding efforts will be undertaken. Additionally, each professional development program within the Triple "L" has its own planning group which includes some steering committee members, but also representation beyond that committee. For example, the TE Collaborative Internship Program required a planning group of twelve individuals, including one district Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources, one Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, several teachers, university faculty and district curriculum directors, meeting bi-weekly over a two hour dinner. The Coordinator of the MA in Teacher Leadership program, a SJSU professor in Educational Leadership, met with district teachers and interested university faculty six different times to plan the MA in Teacher Leadership Program. When beginning teacher support funds became available from the state, it was understood that the Triple "L" Steering Committee would take the time to plan what it would look like, and that both district and university personnel would be involved in writing the proposal.

Further, implementation of the programs is a shared endeavor. Courses within each of the programs are team taught by district and university faculty. In the MA in Teacher Leadership program, the teaming also includes representatives from the local business community. In the support seminars for Faculty Associates and Beginning Teacher Support Providers, facilitation is done by a university/district pair. Shared responsibility extends to the selection of candidates within each of the programs and to the Faculty Associates who work with the preservice students.

The university and the two school districts function under the assumption that all professional development programs, whether they are financed primarily by the university, as in the case of the preservice programs and the MA program; or by the district as in the case of the beginning teacher support program, are jointly planned by everyone and that both the districts and the university share responsibility for their operation.

Shared accountability. With shared responsibility, shared accountability follows logically. District and school representatives from each institution are involved in program planning and implementation, so it is natural that members of the partnership assume responsibility for the outcomes. All partnership representatives decide together what needs to be assessed in terms of program effectiveness. We have been assisted in this endeavor by our participation within the Bay Area School/University Partnership Collaborative, which has suggested three major areas of focus: student learning, adult learning, and institutional change. The plan used for shared accountability and preliminary findings are described in greater depth below, within the research and evaluation section.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Do not reproduce without permission

Alignment. The Triple "L" attends to the alignment of teacher performance standards and assessment practices across each participating institution. So, for example, standards and assessment practices within the preservice program are aligned with the district standards and assessment practices. We use the UC Santa Cruz Continuum of Beginning Teacher Behaviors which is aligned with the California State Standards for the Teaching Profession. In practice, this means that preservice teachers complete the preservice portion of professional development with knowledge of where they are on a continuum rather than with a set of "5s" on a preservice evaluation form or a rating of "meets standard", leading them to think that they are "finished". Further, as they move into beginning teacher positions within the school district, neither they nor their principals need to start from the beginning in deciding what they need to focus on in their professional development. It is a smooth continuation of their preservice work.

Alignment is also addressed in terms of program content. For example, we have placed an emphasis on literacy instruction within the preservice program. To better align the content of the coursework with the expectations of the districts, a district literacy specialist team taught the course one semester with one of the university professors. What resulted was a change in the course content to reflect more emphasis on literacy assessment practices and decoding strategies within the language arts/reading methodology course. This change is documented and will now be an on-going part of the program, no matter who teaches it.

Linkages among adults, programs, institutions. The partnership focuses on the importance of linkages in promoting school restructuring efforts: across participants in each of the professional development programs; between participants in each of these programs and other educators at their respective school sites and at the university; across districts; among professors and school faculty who together plan, implement, and co-teach the professional development programs; and between the Triple "L" and other regional partnerships.

Within the Collaborative, we link programs through: 1) a common use of teacher portfolios and teacher performance standards; 2) an emphasis on action research to inquire about one's practice at all stages of professional development; 3) team teaching by university and school people; and 4) a focus on the development of teachers not only as instructors within the classroom, but as leaders within the school. Additionally, we have a Beginning Teacher/Preservice Support Program which encourages coaching among people at the early stages of professional development; as well as two partnership-wide colloquia each year. Finally, we provide support for, and communication across site administrators in both districts through monthly principal's meetings.

We link people across programs in several ways. Team teaching brings university and district people together around teaching practice. We also emphasize connecting teachers at various stages of the professional development continuum. For example, we started a Buddy Program to connect our first year preservice candidates with beginning teachers. When our second year interns heard about this buddy system, they insisted that they should become the buddies of the first year candidates even though they themselves were in the throws of their first year of teaching. The first and second year intern pairs meet at least three times during a semester, to observe in each other's classrooms and provide coaching. Thus, even at the beginning stages of their careers, these teachers are given the opportunity to take on roles as teacher leaders. Further, we hold two Triple "L" Colloquia each year. These are intended to broaden district and university community participation in the Triple "L" and to keep moving us toward a common vision.

Ten of our MA in Teacher Leadership candidates are now asking to be considered for the position of Faculty Associate next fall as a way of continuing their work within the

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

Collaborative. Second, as stated earlier, the second year interns have paired up with the first year interns to provide each other with feedback and support. Thus, all interns are engaged in a teacher leadership activities. All of the Beginning Teacher Support Providers, across the two districts meet bi-weekly with university faculty to talk with each other about their practice as a coach and to further develop the support program.

Further, the District Liaisons, supported by BASRC funds, play a crucial role in connecting programs and people. Both Liaisons teach a university seminar. One teaches the first year seminar with a university faculty member and the other teaches the seminar for the second year interns. They work together across institutional lines with university faculty to plan numerous events, including steering committee meetings and retreats, Faculty Associate support seminars, and Beginning Teacher Support Provider meetings.

Relationships

Educators participating in PDS partnerships within the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative often report a feeling of being marginalized and disempowered by the district and the university. One of the outcomes that stands out most about the Triple "L" is that participants at all levels feel like they are part of a community of learners and that they have safe places to share their teaching and leadership practice. This is because the structures within the Collaborative have been intentionally set up to provide community and support. All interns and MA candidates participate in their programs as a cohort. After two years together, they form bonds that extend beyond the length of the program. Faculty Associates and beginning teacher support providers also meet bi-weekly, developing their own learning community.

In addition, approximately eight tenure/tenure track university faculty across three divisions in the College of Education work together closely within this partnership. As a result, we have begun to look at how the teacher education, special education, and educational leadership programs link to one another and support the work of the districts.

Research and Evaluation Inside the Triple "L" Partnership

Consistent with the philosophy and practice of the Triple "L" Collaborative, research and evaluation processes are embedded in the on-going work of the partnership. Rather than conducting an external evaluation of the impact of various programs on their participants, the Triple "L" has designed and implemented a system of formative evaluation activities embedded in the day-to-day practice of the partnership. The Triple "L" Steering Committee is actively engaged in the design of the research and evaluation; and district employees, university faculty and various participants in programs take on data collection and analysis roles. For example, district liaisons and Faculty Associates conduct focus groups with, and observations of preservice and beginning teachers, district personnel directors gather and interpret principal evaluations of beginning teachers, and testing and measurement specialists analyze and interpret student performance outcomes from participating Triple "L" classrooms. Methods of data collection including field notes taken during classroom observations, transcribed audiotapes of meetings, meeting minutes, focus groups during program seminars, etc., are viewed as naturally occurring elements of the programs rather than intrusive procedures dictated by external researchers.

This inside/out process of research and evaluation provides participants and partners in various programs with information that informs the ongoing evolution of the partnership designed to support the professional development of educators across the full span of their careers. Information gleaned from inside the programs influences the bigger picture of the collaborative through cross-program linkages and discussions among all partners. In

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

addition, findings about the practices taking place inside schools flows outside to the larger partnership; and input from outside the partnership flows inside to the schools or other institutions. Data collection methods provide insights into both directions of exchange and flow of ideas, supporting systemic reform.

As stated earlier, the overall design for research and evaluation within the Triple "L" is based on the framework for accountability set forth by the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative (BASRC). BASRC's perspective on accountability is considerably different from most major funding sources in educational reform. Within BASRC's School/ University Partnership (SUP) initiative programs, accountability is not about producing quantitative results to report to the external funding source, but about examining strengths and challenges as they relate to the constituents of the partnership -- to the BASRC community of learners, to the participating districts and universities, teachers served by the programs and, most importantly, to the students in the classrooms of partnership members. In essence, accountability is shared.

BASRC SUP programs are supported to design accountability plans that focus on the impact of the programs in three areas 1) student learning, 2) adult learning, and 3) institutional change. The Triple "L" has designed such an accountability plan and determined various data sources and research and evaluation processes embedded in the work of the partnership that reveal how each program (preservice teacher education, beginning teacher support, and MA in teacher leadership) affects these three areas. In addition, various data sources reveal the effects of cross-program connections and the Triple "L" as a whole.

The three tables below depict data sources and preliminary findings by program for each of the three areas of impact. The remaining sections of this paper summarize key data collection processes and examples of findings for each area in the following order: 1) adult learning, 2) institutional change, and 3) student learning. The paper closes with a summary of findings and their implications for next steps in the partnership.

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

Triple L Collaborative -- BASRC Accountability Summary -- Adult Learning

	Preservice Teacher Education	Beginning Teacher Support	MA-Teacher Leadership	Cross Program Linkages
Data Sources	1. Focus Group Feedback on Preservice Program (ongoing each semester with TE1 and TE2) 2. Observation Study -- Literacy Best Practices, Management, Planning, and Assessment (TE2s) 3. Principal Evaluation of New Teachers (TE2s) 4. TE Portfolios •Self Evaluation Continuum	1. Faculty Associate Focus Group and Survey provides feedback on BTSA (ongoing each semester with BTs and faculty associates) 2. Observation Study -- Literacy Best Practices, Management, Planning, and Assessment (TE2s) 3. Principal Evaluation of New Teachers (TE2s)	1. MA Portfolios -- Reflection a) individual leadership b) team evaluation c) school change: •BASRC continuum •Resiliency survey 2. Action Research Projects	1. Meeting Minutes: Principal Meetings and Discussions
Preliminary Findings/Outcomes	1. TE1s confident in their preparation and ready for teaching 2. All BTs in sample well supported. TE2s reveal superior practices in literacy, planning, management 3. High rehire rate for BTs (TEs and other)	1.a) Need for 3 Tier System -- some TE2s require more advanced support than BTSA program expected b) Faculty Associate changes in teaching practices 2. All BTs in sample well supported. TE2s reveal superior practices in literacy, planning, management, and assessment 3. High rehire rate for BTs (TEs and other)	2. Peer Coaching models in place at middle school has supported individual teachers best practices	1. Reveal cross-district principal sharing of ideas and changes in their administrative practice

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Triple L Collaborative -- BASRC Accountability Summary--Institutional Change

	Preservice Teacher Education	Beginning Teacher Support	MA-Teacher Leadership	Cross Program Linkages
Data Sources	1. Partnership Steering Committee Dialogue (ongoing communication and program revision)	1. Partnership Steering Committee Dialogue (ongoing communication and program revision) 2. Focus Group Feedback on BTSA (ongoing each semester)	1. Partnership Steering Committee Dialogue (ongoing communication and program revision) 2. MA Portfolios and Action Research Projects-- a) individual leadership b) team evaluation c) school change: •BASRC continuum •Resiliency survey	1. Partnership Steering Committee Dialogue (ongoing communication and program revision) 2. Meeting Minutes: Principal Meetings and Discussions
Preliminary Findings/Outcomes	1. Shared responsibility for preservice programs a) Joint selection of TE candidates, Faculty Associates b) District liaisons are adjunct SJSU faculty 2. Impact on University practices a) Triple L TE/BTSA evaluation process a model for other SJSU programs b) Revision of SJSU courses to align with district expectations	1. Administrative support for programs at the district level (commitments of time and resources to support program) 2. Need for 3 Tier System -- some TE2s require more advanced support than BTSA program expected 3. Cross district planning for BTSA -- shared resources and events to assist beginning teachers	1. Administrative support for programs at the district level (commitments of time and resources to support program) 2. Changes in school climate and culture (e.g., peer coaching and student leadership roles)	1. Administrative support for programs at the University level (SJSU release time for faculty to direct and evaluate program) 2. Principal best practices shared led to changes in school schedules cross district to support teacher planning time 3. Changing roles of district personnel directors

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Triple L Collaborative -- BASRC Accountability Summary -- Student Learning

	Preservice Teacher Education	Beginning Teacher Support	MA-Teacher Leadership	Cross Program Linkages
Data Sources	2. Spring '99 -- SAT9 and District Performance Assessments	1. Spring '98 -- SAT9 2. Spring '99 -- SAT9 and District Performance Assessments	2. Spring '99 -- SAT9 and District Performance Assessments	2. Spring '99 -- SAT9 and District Performance Assessments to be analyzed. Comparisons of student results for Triple L involvement teachers with others with same years experience and comparable student demographics
Preliminary Findings/Outcomes		1. Overall student performance on Spr. '98 SAT9 comparable in beginning and veteran teacher's classrooms. Grade / Result 2 BT<Vet 3 BT<Vet 4 BT<Vet 5 BT=Vet 6 BT>Vet		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Adult Learning

Since the work of the Triple "L" is focused on professional development for teachers across the span of their careers, it not surprising that the majority of our research processes and results emphasize the impact of the programs on adult learning. Throughout the preservice, beginning teacher support and MA in teacher leadership programs teachers and other Triple "L" participants continually examine their own learning and strive to develop best teaching practices. The practice of teacher self-reflection and collaborative peer support promoted in each program offers a variety of tools and techniques that can be examined for program evaluation purposes. For example, preservice and beginning teacher portfolios include self evaluation continua aligned with the California Standards for the Teacher Profession (CSTP) and MA candidates conduct action research about their learning and compile portfolios that include reflection on individual leadership, team efforts, and school change outcomes. Also, principals from participating schools in the Triple "L" meet monthly to discuss program elements and to reflect on their own learning and changes in school programs based on their involvement. Each of these opportunities for self reflection provides a window into adult learning. Additionally, more formal procedures of data collection on adult learning include periodic focus group conversations within each program, surveys of faculty associates who support preservice and beginning teachers, an observation study of first year teachers, and an analysis of principals' evaluations of first year teachers. Processes and results for several of these data sources are elaborated below.

Preservice and Beginning Teacher Support Findings: An Observation Study. An observation study of beginning teacher practices is currently underway. The purpose of the study is to examine beginning teachers' literacy instruction, planning, classroom management, and assessment practices, in order to inform changes in the preservice and beginning teacher support programs to better serve the needs of beginning teachers. In addition, the study compares teachers participating in the second year of the TE Collaborative Internship program with other first year teachers. The participants include eight first year teachers from the Oak Grove School District. Four are second year Triple "L" preservice education program candidates who teach as full time interns in the district (TE2s), and four are first year teachers who have completed other preservice programs (nonTE2s). The teachers were all volunteers and are matched based on grade level and school demographics.

Each teacher was visited early in the school year and interviewed about characteristics of their students (English language learners, AFDC, resource services, special education, other special needs, etc.), support resources available to them as beginning teachers, approaches to planning, use of available assessment tools, and perceived strengths and challenges as a beginning teacher. Late in the fall, each teacher was formally observed during her literacy instruction block by the district liaison from Campbell who recorded detailed field notes and conducted a post-observation interview. These observation and debriefing practices are similar to those carried out by faculty associates who support preservice and beginning teachers throughout the Triple "L" and were not perceived by beginning teachers as intrusive or threatening. Following the observations, the district liaison and a university faculty member examined the field and interview notes to determine evidence and examples of best teaching practices for literacy instruction, positive learning environments for students, planning, and assessment. Developmental scales were used to rate teachers' performance on eighteen aspects of literacy best practices and each of the elements of the three standards from the CSTP (seven elements for positive environments, six elements for planning, and five elements for assessment) . The ratings for best

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

practices in literacy use a five point scale and the CSTP are rated with a four point. Mean results for each scale are depicted by teacher identification number in the table below.

Mean Ratings of Beginning Teacher's Practices

ID. Number	Literacy Practices	Environment	Planning	Assessment
TE2s				
8709	3.67	3.20	2.00	2.25
7756	2.50	2.80	2.00	2.37
4048	2.85	2.60	2.50	2.33
5403	2.71	2.30	2.00	2.00
mean TE2s	**3.00**	**2.87**	**2.13**	**2.21**
nonTE2s				
9091	2.50	2.40	2.00	2.67
7468	2.00	2.60	2.20	2.00
5887	2.20	2.50	2.00	1.83
0423	2.80	2.20	2.00	1.50
mean nonTE2s	**2.37**	**2.43**	**2.03**	**2.04**

The results for the first observation indicate that the TE2's mean ratings were higher than non TE2s for all areas evaluated. However, all participants performed above expectations for first year teachers, as the developmental scales are designed with preservice and early first year teaching typically represented at the first level of each scale. This result may be due to the very high levels of support received by these teachers who all participated in the Triple "L" beginning teacher support program and had faculty associates, on-site mentors, and other support providers offering assistance to them.

Highest ratings were found for literacy practices and positive classroom environments (management), two areas that often pose great difficulties for first year teachers. Despite these high ratings, several areas for improvement were revealed and have implications for further research and program evolution. First, all teachers received their lowest ratings in the areas of planning and assessment, particularly on sub-scales that address the relationship between these two complex aspects of teaching. In addition, very little evidence was found in any classrooms for several elements related to literacy best practices that address the needs of second or English language learners, despite the presence of these students (in small numbers) in every classroom. It is unclear whether the limited evidence is a function of the observation processes or its true absence in teaching practice. These preliminary results will inform the design of preservice and beginning teacher support seminars for next year. Follow-up observations in the spring will focus on these practices and formal statistical analyses will be conducted on the ratings.

Additional Findings. Consistent with the findings of the observation study, focus group interviews conducted with participants in the preservice teacher education program reveal that these beginning teachers are well prepared for their first year of teaching. For example, TE2s reported that they are confident in their ability to implement best teaching practices in literacy including writer's workshop, literacy centers, guided reading, literacy circles, and journal writing. They also credited the TE Collaborative Internship program course on classroom management for providing them with needed skills, strategies, techniques, and a philosophy for developing a positive learning environment in the early days of teaching. In addition, TE2s revealed that their beginning teacher support seminars (TESS) were often a repeat of what they had learned in the preservice program and they

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

were ready for the kinds of support and action research typically taken on by second year teachers.

The following report in a second year intern's own voice highlights how the TE Collaborative Internship program and its support has impacted her learning, and emphasizes the conditions of shared responsibility, shared accountability, alignment, linkages, and relationships that were present.

As a second year intern, it is difficult to reflect upon the TE Collaborative in comparison with past teacher training programs. I am fortunate to say that the TE Collaborative became my choice as a teacher training program because of the tremendous impact that this program has made on my first year of teaching-which is actually still in progress.

The support by faculty associates has been the most important piece in my experience as an intern and first year teacher. From the beginning of the program, with the first week of orientation, I learned that this program was going to be about support. Back then, however, I did not fully understand the meaning of support in connection to teacher education.

As I began my experience in the classroom with setting up the classroom arrangement, I immediately received the support of my Faculty Associate who guided me through the process as well as introduced me to the staff members who later became key to my support as a first year teacher. The critical part in receiving the support came from others viewing myself as a professional. My identity as a professional did not just remain within my classroom experience as an intern teacher, however. The professors made it quite clear that they viewed the interns as professionals as well.

In the first year of my internship it was a struggle to manage the demands of the classroom and the university coursework. At times, I was overwhelmed with the work. Over the course of the year, San Jose State professors and the Faculty Associates worked together to make constant adjustments to better meet the needs of the interns. For the first time, in my career as a student, I realized that I had some say with what was expected of myself within my roles as a student and as a professional. The professors actually worked together to formulate their class syllabi and for each semester, we were given a master schedule and calendar of assignments.

In addition to the careful planning of our yearly schedules and extreme flexibility of everyone involved with the first year of the program, the connection between the classroom experience and the university coursework was constantly reinforced. Specifically, our reading and language arts methods class involved the participation of Campbell School District's literacy trainer who taught two of our class sessions on guided reading instruction. In fact, the impact of our literacy training, which was so heavily aligned with both districts' literacy plans, prepared us so well, that I found myself in need of more advanced literacy training in my first year of teaching.

Now I am seven months into my first year of teaching, and while I do not

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

have the luxury of another extremely well experienced teacher to share my class with, I have close to the same level of support that I had in my first year of the internship. I have the support of my former faculty associate who I now team with and the support of the staff with whom I experienced an entire year. As a first year teacher, one of my greatest concerns was my lack of resources and supplies for the classroom. With the end of my first year of the internship and beginning of my second year, I became overwhelmed with books and supplies from fellow teachers to the point where I almost felt like a spoiled new teacher.

The district supports me with new teacher support seminars and a new teacher mentor who comes in to help me once a week. In addition, after talking with one of the new teacher mentors, I was moved into the advanced level of literacy training to better meet my professional needs. I also continually receive support from my fellow interns who are a cohort group and consistently provide a listening ear through the struggles and stress of teaching as well as suggest new strategies which challenge me to try new ideas and constantly challenge myself to grow as a teacher.

In preparation for the (Triple "L") Spring Colloquium, our cohort group reflected upon the program thus far. As first year teachers, we have heard stories of experienced teachers sharing about their regretful first years of teaching. One teacher stated that she wished that she could personally apologize to each student in her very first class taught. We, as first year teachers, feel quite differently. Rather than regretting this year, we feel that what we have done and accomplished as first year teachers has been good for our students. We can look back on the year and proudly say that we have given our students a good, quality education. We are not saying that we are perfect teachers and we have not met our potentials yet, but we are continuing to grow and constantly challenge ourselves to work towards it.

Faculty Associate Findings. Like beginning and preservice teachers, faculty associates are also involved in reflection on their own practice as an on-going part of their role within the partnership. Faculty associates use the same developmental continua for the CTSP that preservice candidates use, as part of the application process for faculty associate positions. In addition, they revisit their own teaching practices through end-of-year written reflections and surveys. The Spring '98 reflection addressed various means to improve student learning at faculty associate's schools, their vision of professional preparation, and how their faculty associate roles complement other professional development and leadership activities. Their comments revealed: 1) the value of working with beginning teachers as means of examining their own practice and developing greater confidence; 2) the importance of coaching models in supporting their professional growth; 3) the value of working in a community of learners with other faculty associates to broaden the knowledge base of best practices; and 4) the benefits of accessing additional resources (workshops, training) that support their development. A personal account from one faculty associate highlights many of these issues and again emphasizes the conditions of shared responsibility, shared accountability, alignment, linkages, and relationships.

As a Faculty Associate and new teacher support provider I feel a huge responsibility. In the past student teachers have come and gone, been in my classroom and moved on to jobs, perhaps in my district, perhaps in another. Although I did my best as a master teacher I felt that the

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

ultimate success of student teachers was the responsibility of the university faculty who evaluated them and taught their classes.

The Triple "L" has changed all that. To begin with, their classes are taught by a combination of university and district personnel, just one way in which the lines begin to blur. I am critically involved in the evaluation process and in this way share with the university and district instructors a view of what needs to be taught and what skills need to be shown to successfully complete the program. I am very conscious that I am helping to train someone who may be teaching next door to me (and indeed, and much to my delight, this happened this year) and, therefore, the standards become very real and personal. While I am empowered by this new model of collaboration I am also held more accountable, and I think that this is where much of the intensity of this program comes from.

Accountability to the university because they listen to my feedback and adapt the program accordingly...accountability to the district because the evaluative piece gives me input in the hiring process...accountability to my peers because I am representing them with each of these groups. As new teacher support providers we see the continuation of the process begun in our classrooms as someone struggles to put into practice on their own, ideas and models previously learned, but now independently enacted.

Faculty associates must be willing to open their classroom and themselves to scrutiny, to questions, and to new ideas. We must allow interns to experiment, to try strategies that we ourselves may not be ready to try or that we feel may fail. While never forgetting our responsibility to our students we must also be willing to learn from our interns as well as provide structures for them to learn from us. We must be challenged by their questions, not defensive, for we are accountable to them too for providing the best environment in which to test their new knowledge and try their wings.

As I fill out the rubric for teaching standards for my intern I am also reading through to place myself along the continuum and assess my own weaknesses. This challenges me to find paths for my own growth as a classroom teacher. Perhaps the empowerment of faculty associates is that we are treated as professionals with a stipend and have a day out of our classrooms in which our time and scheduling is our own responsibility. In working collaboratively with district and university personnel, teachers feel that their input matters, that our voices are heard. In this second year of the program major changes, for the better, have taken place because of feedback given by faculty associates and interns in the first year of the program. Our voices were heard and our input valued and this adds to the mutual respect that this program engenders at all levels.

Beyond what I can define with words is a visceral feeling on the part of all the faculty associates I have spoken to that something important is happening here, something different in the way we are seen and treated, something different in the way interns are learning about teaching and something different in the quality of instruction students get because of the interplay of teacher and intern teacher.

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

Institutional Change

The second lens for examining the effects of the Triple "L" focuses on institutional change and reveals aspects of systemic reform. Primary data sources related to institutional change include informal reporting and recording of the evolution of the programs, such as recordings of dialogue generated at Triple "L" steering committee meetings and recorded decisions about programs. We have examined changes in institutions historically by asking "how was it before the Triple "L"?" and "why is it this way now?". In addition, we have examined the nature of institutional participation, roles, and the allocation of resources. As depicted in the tables at the beginning of this section of the paper, institutional change can be attributed to, and analyzed through the lens of each Triple "L" program (preservice teacher education, beginning teacher support, and MA teacher leadership) and in cross-program linkages. Key findings for each are highlighted below.

Preservice Teacher Education. The symbiotic nature of the partnership and close collaboration among school and university partners has resulted in an evolving preservice program that best prepares teachers to work effectively in the cultures and expectations of the districts. One outcome is the shared responsibility for planning and implementation of the preservice program. Specifically, the Triple "L" partners participate in the joint selection of TE candidates and faculty associates. Interviews with TE candidates are carried out by panels representing all partners. It used to be that the university had sole control over who got into the credential program and districts accepted student teachers without any prior information about who they were and how they might best be matched with cooperating resident teachers. Often this random assignment resulted in a mismatch between personalities, interests, abilities and commitments. Also, it used to be that districts, schools or principals had total control over where student teachers would be placed. In some districts the placements were based on "whoever is willing to take them" or "who hasn't done it in a while". In the Triple "L" partnership it's an honor to host an intern and the position must be applied for, with a written application and formal interview. University and district personnel collaboratively screen and select faculty associates, and then permit faculty associates and beginning teachers to select one another during the TE orientation at the start of the program's summer session.

Another example of the symbiotic relationship among preservice program partners is found in the teaching of TE Collaborative Intern Program courses. District liaisons are hired by the university as adjunct faculty with responsibility for co-teaching student teacher seminar classes and supervising of TE Collaborative interns in faculty associates' classrooms. These district liaisons offer support and evaluate the interns' progress to ensure that they will transition from 20% teaching assignments during the first year to 100% intern status in their own classrooms the second year.

Changes in university practices and curricula in the preservice program have also evolved through the Triple "L" partnership. Input from district partners has led to the revision of university preservice courses to better align with district expectations of best teaching practices, student standards, and district assessments. For example, the reading methods course was revised to align with district early literacy and balanced literacy best practices. Faculty associates who act as support providers in each district meet jointly to plan and offer support to each other. Finally, Triple "L" preservice program evaluation and assessment practices (portfolios and self assessment of teaching practices using performance standards and a continuum aligned with CSTP) are now being piloted in other University preservice programs. The practices developed in the Triple "L" are viewed as a model to be implemented across several preservice program options. Triple "L" partners

BEST COPY AVAILABLE
Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

from the districts and university are training university faculty in the observation, supervision and evaluation processes developed by the partnership.

Beginning Teacher Support. The beginning teacher support program in both districts has evolved through collaborative planning among all Triple "L" partners. District commitment to beginning teacher support has resulted in sustained administrative support for the program at the district level. Each district has made substantive commitments of time and resources to support programs. As part of the Triple "L", the beginning teacher support program is developed and implemented through cross-district planning and shared resources. Twelve full time beginning teacher support providers from both districts meet bi-weekly at a support seminar to enhance their own coaching skills and continue refining a common vision of best practices in teaching and learning. In addition, beginning teacher support program assessment tools have influenced the design of evaluation processes for first year teachers, using the California Standards for the Teaching Profession as the basis for all teacher assessment.

MA Teacher Leadership. Like the preservice and beginning teacher support programs, the MA in Teacher Leadership has been provided with administrative support at the district level. Both districts have offered commitments of time and resources to support programs. Also, like the beginning teacher support program, the MA program brings teacher leaders from both districts together for coursework and principals together for monthly discussion. These monthly meetings have resulted in principals sharing their best practices and ideas for school change. One such example is described below by a principal from Oak Grove who implemented a change in school schedules to support time for teacher collaboration based on the ideas of a principal from Campbell.

I had just started attending the Triple "L" principal breakfasts. Peggy was sharing how Sherman Oaks builds in an hour for planning and collaboration. Peggy explained how the students have a running club and a buddy reading program which provides an hour of collaboration and team planning. I had been reading research and been brainstorming with my staff some ideas of doing the same. Ahhha!! The synergistic spark took place. I would do as Peggy did. Hire classified staff and extend the lunch period. I added to the time, hired an extra classified person and added 5, three hour substitutes who teach visual and performing arts classes. A huge need since we had focused so directly on literacy in the past two years, the kids needed more. It was a success with tweaking. We now have a weekly two hours of teachers eating and working together across grade levels on self chosen work teams. The topics are Guided Reading, Six Traits Writing, Reciprocal Teaching, Multi media - Literacy and Literacy Centers. At the beginning of the year the teachers set their goals. The plan they submitted shared the bench marks, process and the final product. Now we are all looking at SAT 9 data in the fall to see if our pilot showed growth. We have already discussed how we would build in a very structured peer coaching component and want to take the Noyce (literacy) training in June to provide support for this piece. I feel so good about this little spark that Peggy's school provided Sakamoto. The synergy sparked from Sherman Oaks Professional Development hour created a true "Gift of Time" for the Sakamoto staff. I love sharing this experience ... I can not give Peggy enough accolades, she is such a good thinker.

Cross Program Linkages. As a result of the Triple "L", the university administration has recognized the demands of partnership work on faculty roles and responsibilities and has begun to commit resources for faculty time and administrative support for programs at university level. Recently, the Dean of the College of Education provided release time for university faculty to direct the Triple "L" and to conduct research and evaluation activities, time that was previously viewed as "service". In addition, the Provost of San José State University recently commented at a conference for teacher educators that the university

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

retention, tenure and promotion process is beginning to recognize partnership work as "scholarship" that will contribute to the advancement of faculty within the university. While the Triple "L" is not the only partnership that has influenced this point of view, it has contributed to the valued understanding of the roles of university faculty within partnerships across the university.

Finally, administrative roles within partnership school districts have also evolved. Both districts employ Triple "L" liaisons, teachers on special assignment, to support the work of the partnership and involve other district teacher leaders and resource personnel to assist with various programs. In addition, the personnel/human resources directors in the districts are defining their roles quite outside traditional boundaries. For example, the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources from Oak Grove is a critical member of the Triple "L" steering committee and acts as a true partner in program decision-making. He has an unusual view for someone in his position in that he views the work with the Triple "L" as his most important work in his district. That is, he perceives the work of the Triple "L" to be consistent with, and supportive of his district goals.

Student Learning

Aligned with Linda Darling-Hammond's (CITE, 1997) findings that student achievement is dependent upon the training and expertise of their teachers, the mission statement of the Triple "L" begins with, "It is our belief that the quality of education is inextricably linked to the quality of their teachers' professional lives". The ultimate pay off of the work of the Triple "L" must be in improved education for our students and their success and achievement in school and society. Without an improvement in student learning, it could be argued that the effort and investment in teacher professional development is a waste of time and resources. While Triple "L" teachers are confident that the support and professional development of the partnership has made them better teachers, it is somewhat more difficult to demonstrate this payoff in student achievement. So many variables influence student success in school and traditional assessment tools may not demonstrate the outcomes of cognitive and social well being that Triple "L" programs attempt to support. However, if we do not attempt to capture such outcomes we will not demonstrate success related to our most important goal -- student learning. So far, few data have been collected by the Triple "L" on student performance outcomes, but several studies are in progress or in development. These include analyses of standardized tests and district performance measures, as well as future plans to examine of samples of classroom work by Triple "L" teachers. Each of these is described in brief below and as next steps.

Spring '98 SAT 9 Analysis. At the end of the first year of the Triple "L"'s teacher education program and first year of the state supported beginning teacher support program, the Oak Grove school district conducted an analysis of student performance using the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT 9). The purpose of the analysis was to determine if students who had beginning teachers performed as well as students who were taught by veterans in the district. Using the national percentile ranking results the analysis revealed that, overall, there was no appreciable difference between the mean NPR for new staff relative to the entire grade level at a specific school site. The trend revealed that the SAT 9 performance for new teachers was more closely linked to the overall grade level performance at that site (i.e., if the grade level does well). A grade by grade breakdown of these results using normal curve equivalents (NCE) and comparing teachers across the district rather than within schools revealed that there was a discrepancy in student performance in new teachers classes for grades 2, 3, and 4, no difference for grade 5, and in grade 6 students in new teachers classrooms outperformed those taught by veterans. The bottom line appears to be that, despite the common sense belief that beginning teachers are less prepared than experienced teachers and, therefore, may not be as "good" at

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

promoting student learning, in general, the beginning teachers have done no harm. However, the results are to be interpreted somewhat cautiously as the numbers of beginning teachers across sites and clustered at grade levels varies considerably and there may be more new teachers in higher or lower performing schools.

Now in the second full year of the TE Collaborative Internship and BTSA programs, we are planning to examine Spring 99 SAT 9 data and district performance assessments (in grades 3-8) to compare students from Triple "L" "classrooms" with students from comparable demographics taught be teachers uninvolved in Triple "L" programs. The district performance assessments address reading, writing, and mathematics learning through on demand but constructed response formats similar to the California Learning and Assessment program (CLAS) piloted in California in the early 1990's. Both districts have designed and implemented these assessment tools over the past 5-7 years and have developed fairly reliable scoring procedures to assess whether or not students reach a criterion referenced grade level standard or benchmark in each subject area. In addition, primary grade teachers use other early literacy tools (e.g., running records and observation surveys) to determine if students have reached these grade level standards. We hope that the analysis of these assessments reveal superior student learning in Triple "L" classrooms. This effort to examine student performance within the Triple "L" is aligned with existing district processes of data collection and accountability and represents once more the Triple "L"'s commitment to shared responsibility, shared accountability and alignment of programs with existing and evolving district needs.

Next Steps

While the data presented here are somewhat preliminary in nature, the impact of the Triple "L" on student and adult learning, as well as institutional change demonstrate the partnership's commitment to systemic change. These data and our ongoing evaluation efforts will continue to inform how shared accountability, shared responsibility, alignment and linkages of district and university professional development, and relationships across the partnership support systemic reform. Below we describe what we anticipate as next steps in the development of a professional development district collaborative. The professional development continuum remains the backbone. We are now lengthening that continuum backwards into the undergraduate years; extending it forward beyond the current programs; and deepening the content within each program. In addition, these next steps will continue to refine and deepen our commitments to the conditions of partnerships necessary for systemic change.

In order to promote alignment of the preservice programs with the urgent needs of districts for well-prepared teachers, we need to extend our professional development work "back" into the undergraduate years. We intend to create a blended five year program which has the TE Collaborative Internship program embedded within it. Our work to date with pre-service candidates suggests the need for many more structured opportunities for candidates considering teaching to have early, extensive experiences in the classroom. We have begun the connection to the Liberal Studies Undergraduate Program this spring by having teachers and faculty members from our Collaborative meeting with students in the Liberal Arts major at SJSU. Further, we have begun placing some of the liberal arts students in early field experiences within one of our two districts. Finally, we are currently working on the development of a blended Liberal Arts/Credential program. In the spirit of shared responsibility and accountability, we will be including district, together with undergraduate and teacher education faculty, in this planning.

Second, now that we have program graduates, we need to establish explicit mechanisms to keep them involved in the work of the Triple "L" and at their school sites. Our challenge

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

will be to create new leadership positions to involve ever greater numbers of teachers within each district, and to provide opportunities for teachers to come together to continue inquiry into their practice. One such opportunity will also assist the partnership in understanding more about the impact of the Triple "L" on student learning. We hope to launch a series of seminars to support teachers to examine student learner more closely aligned with their day to day teaching and assist them in using student performance to guide instructional planning. Graduates of Triple "L" programs (i.e., TE 3's, MA graduates, faculty associates on leave from this role) and other interested teachers in the two districts will be invited to identify two or three students and examine their progress over time in a collaborative dialogue with other teachers. This program will offer teachers important professional development in assessment and instructional planning and provide the partnership with a means for evaluating student progress related to district literacy standards and Triple "L" program goals.

Third, we need to bring university teacher educators together regularly for discussion and support, and to develop a common set of norms. We plan to begin TE Collaborative instructors' "Dine and Discuss" (taken from the name used by the Southern Maine Partnership) meetings monthly at which instructors, representing both district and university personnel, can talk about issues in their practice as teacher educators. We expect this will also further our efforts to involve increasingly more faculty at the university and to develop a shared vision of teaching and learning in teacher preparation.

Fourth, now that we have the structure of the professional development continuum in place, we need to go more deeply into the content of each program. Our work within the BASRC SUP community has heightened our awareness of the role professional development in addressing equity for all students. As noted previously, the observation study suggests that more could be done in preservice and beginning teacher support to assist teachers in meeting the learning needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students. In addition, our programs should continue to reach out to teachers who work in settings that serve these students and actively recruit teachers from under-represented groups into the profession.

Finally, a continuing challenge for this partnership is how to gather evidence which makes a direct connection between the work of the partnership and student achievement in each school district. We are particularly concerned about issues related to equity in the classroom. As stated earlier, we have begun that challenge and expect to make greater progress next year.

We end with the words of one of our District Liaisons who reiterates the conditions of a professional development district model and captures the heart of the Triple "L" Collaborative.

The job of district liaison is a new one for me and for the district. I have been trying to articulate for myself and for others what it is that I do. I am clear that the work that I am now involved in is a continuation, albeit at a much broader level, of a journey I began many years ago to become a caring, competent teacher. At the beginning of my career, I fended for myself, and despite a valiant effort, my students probably fended for themselves as well. I was smart enough to know that learning is a collaborative process and I made a conscious decision to work with a colleague who had a similar vision of teaching and learning. We taught in an open space primary pod and immediately decided to move our 2 desks out of the back of the classroom and into the center open area. Side by side, much to the amazement of other nearby teachers, we came together each morning and each afternoon, over a cup of coffee, to share what was in our heads and hearts, to ask questions and reflect on our teaching and our students' work. Our little group grew to 3.

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

Although small, we were a community of learners working to improve our teaching practice and the success of our students.

Looking back now, those side-by-side desks have become the metaphor for all that I do today as district liaison, that is bring teachers together in a supportive, safe environment to share, reflect, and talk about their teaching and their students' work so that powerful student learning can take place.

My role as a new teacher support provider was, and continues to be an opportunity to model and build collaborative relationships with new colleagues that focuses on ongoing reflection and analysis of teaching practice. Now in our 5th year, our New Teacher Support Program is a state BTSA program, thanks to our partnership with Campbell and SJSU. With 5 full time support providers, a 5-day faculty orientation and a monthly 3-hour TESS seminar that can be taken for university credit. I am part of a partnership team that co-plans and co-teaches the TESS seminar, and I co-plan and co-facilitate a biweekly support seminar for New Teacher Support Providers from Oak Grove and Campbell that focuses on the development of coaching skills and case studies.

Two years ago, I was invited to be part of a team from Oak Grove, Campbell and SJSU to plan an inquiry based program for preservice teachers. Out of our yearlong collaboration the TE Collaborative 20% Internship Program was born. The commitment to bringing preservice teachers and faculty associates together in a supportive environment to reflect and talk about their work and their students' work that is the basis for the TE Collaborative became the basis for the formation of the Triple "L" Collaborative. I knew I had found a professional home.

When I started my own professional development journey, I was able to learn from trusted colleagues through rich shoptalk about theory and practice, and through watching my colleagues teach and getting feedback on my own teaching.

What is so powerful about the preservice and the BTSA experience is the addition of the coaching component in conjunction with the theory and practice. Both programs have a core coaching component that is based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the UCSC Developmental Continuum of Teacher Abilities which is a developmental rubric aligned with the state standards. Both become the focus for ongoing reflection and analysis of teaching practice. Both New Teachers and preservice teachers develop a professional portfolio to document growth, strengths and next steps. These are shared publicly at the end of each school year.

I am an adjunct faculty member at SJSU and so I co-plan and co-teach the 143A field experience course with a professor from SJSU. Together we re-designed the field seminar from a traditional student teaching model to one based on the use of teacher portfolios with an emphasis on coaching, reflection and action research. I also co-plan and co-facilitate the biweekly faculty associate support seminar with a university professor. Like the Support Provider support seminar, we focus on coaching skills and case studies. We are beginning to see the powerful impact of the program, as our 20% interns become new teachers during the 2nd year of the program. They appear to be about a year ahead of a typical first year teacher entering the profession. We are having to redesign our new teacher TESS seminar to accommodate our interns who are ready in their very first year of teaching to begin doing action research projects.

By supporting relationships that promote inquiry and self-reflection I believe that we empower teachers to become leaders at both the district and site levels. Veteran teachers who are willing to open up their classrooms and their hearts and minds to support and

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

coach preservice candidates over a full school year are leaders in the best sense of the word. So, too, are 2nd year interns who are in their first year of full time teaching and volunteer to become a "buddy" to a 20% intern. Jody and I co-planned and co-facilitate the buddy program that allows TE 1's and TE 2's to observe in each other's classrooms at least 3 times during the spring semester. They then meet to talk about what they have seen. This has become a caring peer coaching relationship and a direct link to our New Teacher program. TE 2's take on a beginning leadership role in their first full year of teaching and TE 1's are able to relate to a teacher who is one year ahead Vs 15-20 years ahead of them.

At the heart of the collaborative are the supportive, coaching relationships. The coffee klatch of 15 years ago is being recreated on a daily basis and in a more powerful way in the Triple "L": as faculty associates meet with interns; as support providers meet with new teachers; as interns meet in their cohort; as new teachers meet in their cohort; as faculty associates meet in their cohort; as support providers meet in their cohort; as liaisons meet with SJSU faculty, and even as the steering committee meets. I feel privileged to be part of a school/university partnership that is committed to creating excellent staff development opportunities that connect teachers on an on-going basis to talk about their practice and their students' work. Those symbolic desks are being pushed together each and every day in the Triple "L" Collaborative.

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission

Bibliography

Brandt, R.(October, 1993). *On Restructuring Roles and Relationships: A Conversation wi.h Phil Schlechty.* Educational Leadership, 8-11.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). *A nation prepared; Teachers for the 21st Century* , Washington, D.C.

Clift, R., Houston, W., and Pugach, M.(1989). *Restructuring teacher education through collaborative action research.* Journal of Teacher Education, 41, 52-62.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1993*). Reframing the school reform agenda: Developing capacity for school transformation*, 71 (June): 755.

Drucker, P.(1985). Innovation and entrepreneurship. New York: Harper and Row.

Futrell, M.(1994). *Empowering teachers as learners and leaders.* In Teachers as Leaders, ed. D. Walling, 119-135.

Goodlad, J. (1987). *Linking Schools and Universities -- Symbiotic Partnerships.* Seattle, Washington: Institute for the Study of Educational Policy.

Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J. (1991). *Why we need a complete redesign of tea.'ier education,"* Educational Leadership 49(3).

Hargreaves, A. (ed.) (1997). Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook. Alexandria, VA.

Holmes Group (1986). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* East Lansing, Michigan.

Lieberman, A . ed.(1995). The work of restructuring schools. Teachers College Press: New York.

Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P.(1993). Restructuring Schooling - Learning from Ongoing. Efforts. Newbery Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Myers, C.B.(1996). *University/School Collaborations: A Need to Reconceptualize Schools as Professional Learning Communities Instead of Partnerships.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY).

O'Neil, J. (1995*). On lasting school reform: A conversation with Ted Sizer.* Educational Leadership, 4-9.

Pagrow, S.(1996). *Reforming the wannabe reformers.* Phi Delta Kappan, 77(10), 656-663.

Quisenberry, N. McIntyre, J. and Byrd, D. (1990). *Collaboration and reflectivity: Cornerstones of a teacher education program.* In Schwartz, H, ed. Collaboration: Building Common Agendas. American Association of Colleges for Teacher education, Washington, D.C.

Tye, K. (1992). *Restructuring our schools: beyond the rhetoric.* Phi Delta Kappan, 8-14.

Wilson, E., McClelland, S., and Banaszak, R.(1995). *Empowering teachers as full partners in the preparation of new teachers.* Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Conference.

Markowitz and Whittaker, April, 1999
Do not reproduce without permission